

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/529,854	03/31/2005 .	Kojiro Tanaka	052343	5346	
	38834 7590 07/20/2007 WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP			EXAMINER	
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW			SHEN, BIN		
SUITE 700 WASHINGTO	N DC 20036		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
***************************************	.,		1657		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/20/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/529,854	TANAKA, KOJIRO	
Office Ad	ction Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
•		Bin Shen	1657	
The MAILING Period for Reply	DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED ST. WHICHEVER IS LO - Extensions of time may be after SIX (6) MONTHS fro - If NO period for reply is sp Failure to reply within the Any reply received by the	ATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL'NGER, FROM THE MAILING Do a variable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 m the mailing date of this communication secified above, the maximum statutory period viscoffice later than three months after the mailing ment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. imely filed  In the mailing date of this communication.  ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status	,	*.		
2a) ☐ This action is 3) ☐ Since this app	o communication(s) filed on <u>27 A</u> FINAL 2b)⊠ This  dication is in condition for alloward  ordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.  nce except for formal matters, pr		
Disposition of Claims				
4a) Of the abo 5) ☐ Claim(s) 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-4 a</u> 7) ☐ Claim(s)	and 9-16 is/are rejected.	withdrawn from consideration.		
Application Papers				
10) The drawing(s Applicant may r Replacement d	on is objected to by the Examine ifiled on is/are: a) account request that any objection to the rawing sheet(s) including the correct claration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C	C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgme a) All b) So 1. Certified 2. Certified 3. Copies applicat	ent is made of a claim for foreign ome * c) None of: d copies of the priority document d copies of the priority document of the certified copies of the priority document ion from the International Bureaud detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References C 2) Notice of Draftsperson's 3) Information Disclosure Paper No(s)/Mail Date	s Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5)  Notice of Informal F 6)  Other:	Date	

#### DETAILED ACTION

The IDS received 3/31/2005, the preliminary amendment received 3/31/2005 have been entered.

#### Election

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 1-4, 9-16, in the reply filed on 4/27/2007 is acknowledged.

Claims 5-8, 17, 18 are nonelected and thus are withdrawn from further consideration.

Only claims 1-4, 9-16 are presented for examination on the merits.

## Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract must be a single paragraph. Correction is required. See MPEP  $\S$  608.01(b).

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using

phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

### Claim Objections

2. Claim 16 is objected to as depending from a non-elected claim. The Examiner recommends rewriting Claim 16 to incorporate all the language of Claim 5, from which it depends.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1-2, 10-11, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tsai et al. (Proceedings of the Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine 1986;183:74-80).

Tsai et al. teach a measuring kit (abstract and page 75, Fig.1) of microorganisms in a liquid sample comprising a first syringe, a flocculant (read as syringe pump), a first filter case (page 75, right column, 1<sup>st</sup> full paragraph), a second filter case, a second syringe (end of page 75 to beginning of page 76), a washing liquid (page 76, line 7); a bacteriolytic agent (page 75, left column, 2<sup>nd</sup> full paragraph), a measuring tube, a luminous reagent (page 76, 2<sup>nd</sup> full paragraph), a luminometer (page 76, right column, 1<sup>st</sup> full paragraph), wherein the filtering material of a pore diameter of about 1 µm to about 10

 $\mu m$  as the first filter (page 75, right column, 1<sup>st</sup> full paragraph, lines 18-19), wherein the second filter is a porous polymer membrane having pores of a pore diameter of about 0.1  $\mu m$  to about 0.5  $\mu m$  (page 76, left column, line 1), wherein a sterile distilled water is added to the sample (page 75, Fig. 1).

Claims 1-2, 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Trudil (USPN6395504B1).

Trudil et al. teach a measuring kit (abstract) of microorganisms in a liquid sample comprising a first syringe, a flocculant, a first filter case (col. 4, lines 3-9), a second filter case, a second syringe (col. 4, 12-14), a washing liquid (col. 4, line 25); a bacteriolytic agent (col. 2 lines 63-64), a measuring tube, a luminous reagent, a luminometer (col. 4, lines 30-39), wherein the filter cases are disposable (col. 4, lines 12, 15).

Therefore, the cited reference is deemed to anticipate the instant claims above.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/529,854

Art Unit: 1657

4. Claims 1-4, 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Tsai et al. in view of Trudil et al. and Tanaka et al. (Wat. Res. 1997;31(8):1913-1918).

Tsai teaches what is above.

Tsai does not teach a filtering accelerating agent, the filter cases are disposable, using of ethanol.

Trudil teaches what is above and that the filter cases are disposable (col. 4, lines 12, 15).

Tanaka teaches a measuring kit of microorganisms that filter with a suction pump (page 1914, bottom of right column), and the ATP extractive reagent contains ethyl alcohol (page 1914, right column, line 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Tsai by using a filtering accelerating agent (such as a suction pump), using ethanol, and using disposable filter cases as taught by Trudil and Tanaka because the three kits are all used to measure microorganisms. One would have been motivated to make the modification because it will speedup the measurement, and would reasonably have expected success in view of both Trudil and Tanaka's teachings. The adjustment of particular conventional working conditions (e.g., choice of particular filtering accelerating agent, solvent to dissolve bacteriolytic agent) is deemed merely a matter of judicious selection and routine optimization which is well within the purview of the skilled artisan having the cited reference before him/her.

From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention.

Therefore, the invention as a whole was prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

#### Conclusion

#### 5. No claim is allowed.

Certain papers related to this application may be submitted to Art Unit 1657 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993) and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 C.F.R. § 1.6(d)). The official fax telephone number for the Group is 571-273-8300. NOTE: If Applicant does submit a paper by fax, the original signed copy should be retained by applicant or applicant's representative. NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers in the Office.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify

applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.

Any inquiry concerning rejections or objections in this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bin Shen, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-9040. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, from about 9:00 AM to about 5:30 PM. A phone message left at this number will be responded to as soon as possible (i.e., shortly after the examiner returns to her office).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Jon Weber can be reached at (571) 272-0925.

RALPH GITOMER PRIMARY EXAMINER

Meloner

**GROUP 1200** 

B Shen

Art Unit 1657